UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

LAKE CHARLES DIVISION

MOHAMED BAH : DOCKET NO. 2:05-cv-1611

Section P

VS. : JUDGE MINALDI

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND

SECURITY, ET AL.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE WILSON

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Currently before the court is a petition for writ of habeas corpus filed by pro se petitioner, Mohamed

Bah, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2241. By this petition, Petitioner challenges his continued detention pursuant

to INA § 241.

This petition for writ of habeas corpus was filed by petitioner to challenge his continued detention

post-removal-order custody. In light of the facts presented by petitioner, the court ordered the government

to respond to the petition. Following the filing of the answer, the court determined that an evidentiary hearing

was necessary for the adjudication of this habeas corpus petition. The evidentiary hearing was set for the

purpose of hearing evidence on whether there is a significant likelihood of removing petitioner in the

reasonably foreseeable future.

Prior to the hearing date of April 6, 2006, counsel for the petitioner informed the court that petitioner

had posted an immigration bond or would be posting an immigration bond in the near future. In light of this

development, counsel for the petitioner requested that the hearing in this matter be continued. The respondent

did not oppose a continuance. Accordingly, the undersigned upset the hearing and ordered both parties to

present summary judgment evidence on the issue of whether petitioner has been released from post-removal-

order custody within 15 days of the date of the minute entry.

The respondent has filed summary judgment evidence which establishes that the petitioner was

released to an Order of Supervision on April 5, 2006 upon the posting of a \$5000 bond. See Government

Exhibit A. Petitioner has filed no contradictory evidence.

Therefore, the evidence before the court establishes that petitioner was released from post-removal-

order detention to an Order of Supervision. At the time that this petition was filed, petitioner was in detention

pursuant to the statutory authority of § 241 of the INA, and he sought to have the court review his post

removal order detention. However, because the petitioner is no longer in custody, his challenge to his post-

removal-order detention is now moot and should be dismissed.

For this reason,

IT IS RECOMMENDED that this petition for writ of habeas corpus be DENIED AND DISMISSED

WITH PREJUDICE as moot.

Under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(C), the parties have ten (10) business days from receipt

of this Report and Recommendation to file any objections with the Clerk of Court. Timely objections will

be considered by the district judge prior to a final ruling.

FAILURE TO FILE WRITTEN OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED FINDINGS AND

RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT WITHIN TEN (10) BUSINESS DAYS

FROM THE DATE OF ITS SERVICE SHALLBAR AN AGGRIEVED PARTY FROM ATTACKING

ON APPEAL, EXCEPT UPON GROUNDS OF PLAIN ERROR, THE UNOBJECTED-TO

PROPOSED FACTUAL FINDINGS AND LEGAL CONCLUSIONS ACCEPTED BY THE DISTRICT

COURT.

THUS DONE AND SIGNED in Chambers at Lake Charles, Louisiana, this 26th day of May, 2006.

ALØNZO P. WILSON

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

2